

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. Claim 13 has been amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter in claims 3, 5-6, and 19-21.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 13-14, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as assertedly being anticipated by Danko (U.S. Patent No. 6,879,391 B1). Claims 8-12 and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Danko in view of Applicant's admitted prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1, as originally filed, is directed to a method for inspection of periodic structures on a lithography mask and specifically recites, "calibrating a first image of each array structure for selected locations on the *lithography mask*" (emphasis added). Danko, on the other hand, never teaches or suggests any lithography mask. Rather, Danko is directed to a method for detecting contaminant particles and/or pattern defects on the front surface of a patterned semiconductor wafer. Col. 4, line 35. *See also* col. 5, line 36. The reference simply provides no suggestion of inspecting a lithography mask.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 7, as originally filed, specifically recites, "repairing the lithography mask based upon results of the inspecting." As discussed above, Danko does not teach or suggest a

lithography mask. Danko certainly does not teach or suggest repairing a lithography mask based upon results of an inspection of the mask. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 8-12 depend from claim 7 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 13, as originally filed, specifically recites manufacturing a lithography mask, inspecting the lithography mask and patterning a resist material using the lithography mask. Danko does not teach or suggest any of these steps. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 13 is allowable over the references of record.

Claims 14-21 depend from claim 13 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issuance. If the Examiner should have any questions, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the address below. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, in the event that there are any fees due, please charge the same, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira S. Matsil
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 35,272

April 20, 2006
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd.
Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218